arXiv:1304.6041v1 [gr-qc] 22 Apr 2013

# Scalar radiation at finite temperature near a reflecting wall

V. A. De Lorenci*
*Instituto de Física e Química, Universidade Federal de Itajubá, Itajubá, MG 37500-903, Brazil*

L. G. Gomes† and E. S. Moreira, Jr.‡
*Instituto de Matemática e Computação, Universidade Federal de Itajubá, Itajubá, MG 37500-903, Brazil*

(Dated: March 19, 2013)

This paper addresses the interplay between vacuum and thermal averages for massless scalar radiation near a plane wall of a large cavity where the Dirichlet boundary condition is assumed to hold. It is shown that the "Stefan constant" depends on the curvature coupling parameter and that the latter is restricted to a certain range by thermodynamic arguments. In more than three spacetime dimensions such a range contains the conformal coupling, but it does not contain the minimal coupling. Findings may be relevant in settings where arbitrarily coupled scalar fields are present.

PACS numbers: 04.62.+v, 05.70.-a

## INTRODUCTION

When physics of black body radiation in a cavity is derived in statistical mechanics textbooks the energy of the vacuum is usually ignored. The argument is that since the vacuum is by definition the state of minimum energy of a system, and one is interested only in the energy that can be extracted from the cavity, then the energy of the vacuum is effectively zero. In this context, electromagnetic radiation in thermodynamic equilibrium with the walls of a large cavity at temperature $T$ is addressed either by considering it as an ideal gas of massless bosons or an ensemble of harmonic oscillators. Any of these tools leads to the energy density $u$ and pressure $P$ (equation of state) given by,

$$u = \frac{\pi^2}{15}\frac{(k_B T)^4}{(\hbar c)^3}, \qquad P = \frac{u}{3}, \tag{1}$$

where the fundamental constants $\hbar$ and $c$ in Eq. (1) point out the quantum-relativistic nature of the phenomenon.

In another different but presumably equivalent approach, one considers an ensemble of infinite cubic cavities containing each the quantum field — quantum field at finite temperature. When techniques are applied to the electromagnetic field it results the following ensemble average for the stress-energy-momentum tensor,

$$\langle T^{\mu\nu}\rangle = \mathrm{diag}(u, P, P, P), \tag{2}$$

with $u$ and $P$ given precisely by Eq. (1). If one of the walls of the cavity is brought isothermally from infinity and parallel to the opposite fixed wall, $\langle T^{\mu\nu}\rangle$ changes radically, loosing its isotropic character although remaining uniform [1]. When the distance between these two walls is small enough, $\langle T^{\mu\nu}\rangle$ is such that hardly depends on $T$; in fact it does not even vanish when $T = 0$. At this stage, the two walls are attracted to each other — the Casimir effect — and that is a surprising dynamical manifestation of the vacuum state in quantum field theory (see reviews [2, 3]).

There are also manifestations of the electromagnetic vacuum when the walls are far apart. When a large cavity has curved walls [4–7], the behavior of electromagnetic radiation in the bulk is still essentially given by Eqs. (2) and (1). Approaching a wall one sees that $\langle T^{\mu\nu}\rangle$, in fact, is not uniform. In particular near the wall the expression for $u$ in Eq. (1) becomes a subleading contribution in $\langle T^{00}\rangle$. The corresponding leading contribution is a temperature independent term, which diverges as the curved wall is approached if the perfect conductor boundary conditions are taken on it [4, 7].

Considering now massless scalar radiation, deep in the bulk of a large cavity Eqs. (2) and (1) hold, after halving $u$ due to absence of polarization. In analogy with electromagnetic radiation in a cavity with curved walls, one will eventually notice that $\langle T^{\mu\nu}\rangle$ is not uniform by moving toward a wall, but this time regardless of whether the wall is curved or not. As has been shown in Ref. [6], the thermal behavior of $\langle T^{00}\rangle$ near a reflecting plane wall will be still Planckian, but the corresponding "Stefan constant" will depend on the kind of boundary condition — Dirichlet or Neumann — that is assumed to hold on the wall.

Another new ingredient that thermal scalar radiation brings about, and that has been overlooked in the literature, is the dependence of $\langle T^{\mu\nu}\rangle$ on the curvature coupling parameter $\xi$. As is well known, in flat spacetime $\xi$ does not appear in the wave equation; but it does appear in the corresponding stress-energy-momentum tensor. The reason is that the variation of the action with respect to the metric that leads to $T^{\mu\nu}$ is made before solving the Einstein equations which yield the flat geometry. Using the scalar Feynman propagator to obtain $\langle T^{\mu\nu}\rangle$ according to the "point splitting procedure" [8], this paper investigates the dependence of $\langle T^{\mu\nu}\rangle$ on $\xi$ near a reflecting plane wall of an infinite cavity in flat spacetime with arbitrary number of dimensions. The main result is that by requiring thermodynamic equilibrium only values of $\xi$ restricted to a certain range are acceptable. In the rest of the text, unless stated otherwise, $\kappa_B = \hbar = c = 1$.

## THE SCALAR PROPAGATOR

A plane wall is taken at $x = 0$, where the massless scalar field $\phi$ vanishes — Dirichlet's boundary condition. All the other walls of the $(N-1)$-dimensional cavity are at infinity. Radiation in the cavity is assumed to be in thermodynamic equilibrium with the wall at temperature $T$, so one uses the formalism of analytically continuing time $t$ to imaginary values, taking $it$ periodic with period $1/T$. Observing these prescriptions the equation [8]

$$\Box_{\mathrm{x}} D_{\mathcal{F}}(\mathrm{x}, \mathrm{x}') = -\delta^N(\mathrm{x} - \mathrm{x}') \tag{3}$$

is solved to obtain the scalar propagator. The solution is well known for $N = 4$ (see Ref. [8], and references therein). When $N > 3$,

$$\begin{aligned} D_{\mathcal{F}}(\mathrm{x}, \mathrm{x}') = &-\frac{i}{4\pi^{N/2}}\Gamma\left(\frac{N-2}{2}\right) \\ &\times \sum_{n=-\infty}^{\infty}\left[(-\sigma_-)^{(2-N)/2} - (-\sigma_+)^{(2-N)/2}\right], \end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

where $\sigma_\pm := (t - t' - in/T)^2 - (x \pm x')^2 - (y - y')^2 - (z - z')^2 - \cdots$ plus an infinitesimal negative imaginary term. Noting that the term corresponding to $n = 0$ and involving $\sigma_-$ in Eq. (4) is simply the zero temperature propagator in ordinary Minkowski spacetime, direct application of $\Box_{\mathrm{x}}$ to Eq. (4) yields promptly Eq. (3). In the following, the Minkowski propagator will be dropped in order to implement renormalization. It is worth mentioning that for $N \leq 3$ familiar divergences arise [9]. As will be seen shortly, such divergences do not bother $\langle T^{\mu\nu}\rangle$ though when $N \geq 2$.

## THE STRESS-ENERGY-MOMENTUM TENSOR

The expectation value of the stress-energy-momentum tensor can be obtained by applying the differential operator [8]

$$\mathcal{D}^{\mu\nu} := (1 - 2\xi)\partial^\mu\partial^{\nu'} - 2\xi\partial^\mu\partial^\nu + (2\xi - 1/2)\eta^{\mu\nu}\partial^\lambda\partial_{\lambda'}$$

to the renormalized propagator,

$$\langle T^{\mu\nu}\rangle = i \lim_{\mathrm{x}' \to \mathrm{x}} \mathcal{D}^{\mu\nu} D_{\mathcal{F}}(\mathrm{x}, \mathrm{x}'),$$

resulting that $\langle T^{\mu\nu}\rangle$ is conserved, traceless when $\xi = \xi_N$ (conformal coupling),

$$\xi_N := \frac{N-2}{4(N-1)}, \tag{5}$$

and with diagonal form,

$$\langle T^{\mu\nu}\rangle = \mathrm{diag}(\rho, P_\perp, P_\parallel, \cdots, P_\parallel). \tag{6}$$

The only component that is uniform in Eq. (6) is the pressure perpendicular to the wall,

$$P_\perp = \frac{1}{\pi^{N/2}}\Gamma\left(\frac{N}{2}\right)\zeta(N)T^N. \tag{7}$$

The interest here is on the asymptotic behaviors of the quantities in Eq. (6). For convenience formulas will be specialized to non negative $x$. In the bulk ($Tx \gg 1$) one finds for the energy density,

$$\rho = (N-1)P_\perp + \rho_{\texttt{class}}, \tag{8}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_{\texttt{class}} := &\frac{2^{2-N}}{\pi^{(N-1)/2}}(N-2) \\ &\times \Gamma\left(\frac{N-1}{2}\right)\left(\xi - \frac{1}{4}\right)\frac{T}{x^{N-1}}, \end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

and for the pressure parallel to the wall ($N \geq 3$),

$$P_\parallel = P_\perp + P_{\texttt{class}}, \tag{10}$$

where $P_{\texttt{class}}$ is given by the negative of Eq. (9) with $\xi - 1/4$ replaced by $\xi - \xi_{N-1}$. Eqs. (8) and (10) are exact up to exponentially small corrections, and at high temperatures they apply also near the wall.

Moving now near the wall ($Tx \ll 1$), $P_\perp$ is still given by Eq. (7) since it is uniform. Neglecting terms with higher powers of $Tx$, it results that

$$\begin{aligned} \rho = &\frac{2}{(4\pi)^{N/2}}(N-1)\Gamma\left(\frac{N}{2}\right)(\xi - \xi_N)x^{-N} + \\ &+ \frac{1}{\pi^{N/2}}\Gamma\left(\frac{N}{2}\right)\zeta(N)(1 - 4\xi)T^N, \end{aligned} \tag{11}$$

and that

$$P_\parallel = -\rho. \tag{12}$$

Clearly, Eqs. (11) and (12) hold also everywhere at low temperatures.

Part of the material in Ref [6] concerns with thermal scalar radiation near a reflecting plane wall. By setting in Eq. (8) $N = 4$ and $\xi = 0$ (minimal coupling), or $\xi = 1/6$ [conformal coupling when $N = 4$, cf. Eq. (5)], the results in Ref. [6] are successfully reproduced. Eq. (11) also reproduces the corresponding expression in Ref. [6], when $N = 4$ and $\xi = 1/6$. Ref. [10] has investigated thermal scalar radiation between two parallel reflecting walls separated by unity, providing a formula for $\langle T^{\mu\nu}\rangle$ with arbitrary $\xi$ and $N = 4$. It has been checked that, by reintroducing arbitrary distance between the walls and taking it to infinity, the resulting asymptotic behaviors of $\langle T^{\mu\nu}\rangle$ in Ref. [10] agree with those above, after setting $N = 4$.

## DISCUSSION

The expression for $P_\perp$ in Eq. (7), which holds everywhere at arbitrary $T$, is precisely the usual black body radiation pressure in $N$ dimensions. Deep in the bulk ($x \to \infty$) $\rho_{\texttt{class}}$ and $P_{\texttt{class}}$ in Eqs. (8) and (10) can be neglected, resulting the usual relations proper of the uniform and isotropic black body radiation.

By reintroducing dimensionful $\hbar$ in Eqs. (8) and (10), one sees that the "classical" corrections $\rho_{\texttt{class}}$ and $P_{\texttt{class}}$ carry $\hbar^0$ whereas the black body quantities carry a negative power of $\hbar$, namely, $\hbar^{1-N}$. Although the terminology "classical" is at some extent justified, by setting $\hbar \to 0$ the "classical" corrections effectively vanish since the black body quantities diverge. In the context of $N = 4$, Ref. [6] has pointed out that the only relevant correction to the black body contribution in Eq. (8) is linear in $T$. Now it can be seen from Eq. (9) that this is so regardless the number of dimensions $N$. This fact resembles the equipartition principle of energy, and it could not be reached simply by using dimensional arguments. At this point it should be noted that "classical" contributions also appear in the context of Casimir's effect at finite temperature [1, 4] (see also Refs. [2, 3], and references therein).

Whereas only the subleading contribution in the expression for $\rho$ in the bulk [cf. Eq. (8)] carries dependence on $\xi$, both terms in Eq. (11) depend on it. As the wall is approached, the vacuum energy density in Eq. (11) diverges for $\xi \neq \xi_N$ [11], and this limitation is commonly understood as a consequence of replacing a real reflecting plane wall (which has some thickness) by a boundary condition on a plane [5] (see also Ref. [6], for an alternative interpretation). Although the subleading contribution in Eq. (11) does not depend on $x$, strictly speaking it should not be taken as purely thermal. Its mixed nature (vacuum-thermal) is reflected in the fact that it depends both on $\xi$ and $T$. As has been pointed out in Ref. [6] for $N = 4$, and mentioned earlier in the text, the behavior in Eq. (11) resembles that for electromagnetic radiation near a curved wall where the perfect conductor boundary condition is assumed to hold [4]. An important difference though is that the subleading contribution in the case of the electromagnetic radiation is the very black body energy density, and thus purely thermal. Another feature near the wall (or everywhere at low temperatures) that should also be remarked is that whereas $P_\perp$ in Eq. (7) is always positive, each term of $P_\parallel$ in Eq. (12) can be negative depending on $\xi$.

The expression for the specific heat per unit of volume in the bulk [cf. Eq. (8)] is given by

$$c_V = \frac{N(N-1)}{\pi^{N/2}}\Gamma\left(\frac{N}{2}\right)\zeta(N)T^{N-1} + \frac{\rho_{\texttt{class}}}{T}, \qquad (13)$$

where the factor multiplying $NT^{N-1}$ is the familiar "Stefan constant" in $N$ spacetime dimensions. Near the wall [cf. Eq. (11)],

$$c_V = \frac{N}{\pi^{N/2}}\Gamma\left(\frac{N}{2}\right)\zeta(N)(1-4\xi)T^{N-1}, \qquad (14)$$

which also has Planckian form, but now the "Stefan constant" depends on $\xi$. Examining these equations one sees that $c_V$ in the bulk is always positive, but near the wall it can be negative. Assuming scalar radiation in thermodynamic equilibrium on each side of the wall, if the temperature $T_R$ on the right side is slightly higher than that on the left, $T_R > T_L$, the net pressure on the wall will be given by the difference of the corresponding values of $P_\perp$ as in Eq. (7). If a tiny puncture is made on the wall, then energy will flow from the right to the left — these are consequences of the integral version of the conservation law $T^{\mu\nu}{}_{,\nu} = 0$, and that the energy flux density is equal to the momentum density. Noting Eq. (14), when $\xi > 1/4$, $c_V < 0$ resulting that $T_R$ becomes even higher and $T_L$ lower, i.e., the system is carried way from thermodynamic equilibrium. It follows then that $\xi$ must not be greater than 1/4.

A similar kind of arguments near the wall show that $\xi$ may also have a lower bound. One begins by considering a tiny cubic region of the scalar radiation near the wall, and say facing the wall. It is further assumed that the temperature $T_{in}$ inside the cube is slightly higher than the temperature $T_{out}$ outside. Using once again the integral version of the conservation law $T^{\mu\nu}{}_{,\nu} = 0$ and that the energy flux density is equal to the momentum density, it follows from Eqs. (6), (7), (11) and (12) that the flux of energy out of the tiny cubic region is given by $[1-(N-2)(1-4\xi)](T_{in}^N - T_{out}^N)$ times a positive factor that includes a small time interval. As $T_{in} > T_{out}$ and $\xi < 1/4$ by assumption, the energy inside the cube must decrease [cf. Eq. (14)], otherwise the system will run way from thermodynamic equilibrium. Accordingly, the flux above must be positive, i. e., $1-(N-2)(1-4\xi) > 0$. Putting all together, $\xi$ needs to be such that

$$\xi < \frac{1}{4} \qquad (15)$$

for $N = 2$, and

$$\xi_{N-1} < \xi < \frac{1}{4} \qquad (16)$$

for $N > 2$. It is rather curious that the lower bound in Eq. (16) is the conformal coupling in one less dimension [cf. Eq. (5)], and that the upper bound is the limit of $\xi_N$ as $N \to \infty$. Thus the conformal coupling $\xi_N$ fits in Eq. (16), but the minimal coupling $\xi = 0$ does not. As can be readily seen, to eventually including equalities in Eqs. (15) and (16), further corrections in Eqs. (11) and (12) are required. It should be additionally noted that when $N \to \infty$, the interval in Eq. (16) narrows to a point, encapsulating the conformal coupling.

A connection between Eq. (16) and the "classical" corrections in Eqs. (9) and (10) is worth pointing out. The "classical" corrections are related by

$$\left(\xi - \frac{1}{4}\right) P_{\texttt{class}} = (\xi_{N-1} - \xi)\, \rho_{\texttt{class}}, \tag{17}$$

and therefore Eq. (16) implies that $P_{\texttt{class}}$ and $\rho_{\texttt{class}}$ have the same sign. Now, whereas Eq. (17) is a feature of the behavior of the scalar radiation in the bulk, the permissible range in Eq. (16) arises by considering its behavior near the wall.

Mathematically speaking, a wall is a boundary condition assumed to hold on a surface to prevent flux of energy across the surface. As Eqs. (15) and (16) were obtained assuming the Dirichlet boundary condition, it is pertinent to ask if another commonly used boundary condition, namely the Neumann boundary condition, leads to the same result. In other words one may wish to know how much dependent on the type of boundary condition Eqs. (15) and (16) are. A preliminary answer can be obtained from Ref. [10]. After manipulating formulas in Ref. [10] concerning the Neumann boundary condition, one finds as permissible range $-5/4 < \xi < 7/8$, which is to be compared with Eq. (16) for $N = 4$, i.e., $1/8 < \xi < 1/4$. It follows that, in this case, the permissible range corresponding to the Neumann boundary condition not only includes the minimal coupling $\xi = 0$, but also contains the range corresponding to the Dirichlet boundary condition. The Dirichlet boundary condition is therefore more restrictive.

An important issue to be addressed here is to which extend the atmosphere near the wall can be considered as an ideal gas of massless scalar bosons at temperature $T$. Taking for convenience $N = 4$, one may ask to which extend a standard formula such as (reintroducing dimensionful constants)

$$\rho = \int \frac{d^3p}{h^3} \frac{pc}{e^{pc/k_B T} - 1} \tag{18}$$

still holds in the present situation [cf. Eq. (6)]. It should be noted that the right hand side of Eq. (18) is in fact equal to $U/V$, and strictly speaking the equality might hold only if the internal energy $U$ were uniformly distributed in the cavity, which is clearly not the case for the scalar radiation. Nevertheless, deep in the bulk ($x \to \infty$) Eq. (18) and its corresponding equation of state $p = \rho/3$ hold as follows from the discussion opening this section. Similarly one might guess that the temperature dependent term in Eq. (11) [see also Eq. (14)], which holds near the wall, could be associated to an effective Planck's distribution as in Eq. (18). However, recalling how pressure of a gas on the walls of a cavity is obtained from the distribution function, one sees clearly that such an effective Planck's distribution would fail in reproducing the pressure in Eqs. (7) and (12). This conclusion has to do with the already mentioned mixed nature (vacuum-thermal) of the scalar radiation at finite temperature near the reflecting wall.

Perhaps this duality can be better appreciated by saying, as in Ref. [4], that the atmosphere near the wall is a mixture of virtual and real bosons. Indeed, if initially at any point in the cavity the specific heat is given by the nearly black body expression in Eq. (13), and then the temperature is lowered such that eventually $c_V$ will be given by Eq. (14), as $T \to 0$, $c_V \to 0$ and $P_\perp \to 0$, resulting that at $T = 0$ only virtual bosons are left in the cavity from where no further energy can be extracted — only vacuum energy is left behind.

Differently from the scalar radiation, the thermal behavior of the electromagnetic energy density $\rho$ in the bulk and near a curved wall of a large cavity is the same [4]. Thus an expression like (precisely twice that in) Eq. (18) yields the thermal contribution in the bulk and also near the wall, corresponding to the usual radiation pressure [cf. Eq. (1)]. It follows then that, in this case, one can think of an ideal gas of massless bosons (photon gas) in the bulk, as well as near the wall.

Before closing, it should be noticed that by dropping the vacuum energy density, one can check that the integral over space of $\rho$ in Eq. (6) does not depend on $\xi$, for $N > 2$. This has been pointed out also in Ref. [10] when $N = 4$, for a configuration of two parallel walls, and it is consistent with the fact that standard black body expressions do not carry dependence on $\xi$.

Recapitulating, this paper investigated the vacuum-thermal nature of the scalar radiation. The main conclusion is that statistical mechanics of a scalar field restricts the values of the curvature coupling parameter $\xi$. Corresponding to the Dirichlet boundary condition on a plane wall, such a restriction is characterized by the inequalities in Eqs. (15) and (16). Further still unclear role seems to be played by the bounds in Eq. (16). For example, the symmetrical appearance of these bounds in the "classical" corrections to the black body expressions in the bulk asks for more investigation.

This work was partially supported by the Brazilian research agencies CAPES, CNPq and FAPEMIG.

---

[*] Electronic address: delorenci@unifei.edu.br
[†] Electronic address: lggomes@unifei.edu.br
[‡] Electronic address: moreira@unifei.edu.br

[1] L. S. Brown and G. J. Maclay, Phys. Rev. **184**, 1272 (1969).

[2] K. A. Milton, *The Casimir Effect, Physical Manifestations of Zero-Point energy* (World Scientific, New Jersey, 2001).

[3] M. Bordag, U. Mohideen, and V. M. Mostepanenko, Phys. Rep. **353**, 1 (2001).

[4] R. Balian and B. Duplantier, Ann. Phys. (N.Y.) **112**, 165 (1978).

[5] D. Deutsch and P. Candelas, Phys. Rev. D **20**, 3063 (1979).

[6] G. Kennedy, R. Critchley, and J. S. Dowker, Ann. Phys. (N.Y.) **125**, 346 (1980).

[7] G. Kennedy, Ann. Phys. (N.Y.) **138**, 353 (1982).

[8] N. D. Birrel and P. C. W. Davies, *Quantum Fields in Curved Space* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1982).

[9] S. A. Fulling and S. N. M. Ruijsenaars, Phys. Rep. **152**, 135 (1987).

[10] S. Tadaki and S. Takagi, Prog. Theor. Phys. **75**, 262 (1986).

[11] A. Romeo and A. A. Saharian, J. Phys. A **35**, 1297 (2002).